

Appl. No. 10/825,104
Amdt. Dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 17, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace Figures 1-7 of record with Figures 1-7 as provided on the attached replacement sheets.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 stand rejected in this application. Claims 1-7 have been amended to better clarify the Applicants' invention. Claim 8 is cancelled, without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-7 now remain pending in this application, and the Applicants respectfully submit that each of these claims is in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to explicitly clarify that the mobile alerter is removably connectable to the mobile communication device. Claims 1 and 7 have also been amended to clarify that insofar as the mobile alerter forms the notification unit of the mobile communication device, the mobile alerter outputs notification alerts for the mobile communication device whether the mobile alerter is in a tethered or in an un-tethered mode. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, at paragraphs 21-22 and 32-33, for example. Dependent claims 2-6 have been amended to correct a number of clerical errors, and to be consistent with amended independent claim 1. Claim 6 has been further amended to recite features described at paragraph 19. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

The mobile alerter outputs notification alerts for the mobile communication device even if the mobile alerter is physically connected (tethered mode) to the mobile communication device through the connection interface, and not only when the mobile alerter is physically detached (un-tethered mode) from the mobile communication device.

Since the same mobile alerter outputs notifications alerts for the mobile communication device in both the tethered and un-tethered modes, the mobile alerter might be employed, for example, to provide complete alerting functionality for a mobile communication device. In that example, notification hardware would not need to be replicated on both the mobile alerter and the mobile

communication device. This may reduce manufacturing costs. Put another way, the mobile communication device itself need not be equipped with alerting functions, since a buzzer, bell, sound, alarm, flashing light, etc. will already be provided by the mobile alerter. In a variant embodiment, the mobile alerter may alternatively be adapted for use with mobile communication devices that do have a built-in notification system (see e.g. paragraph [0044]). In that embodiment, the mobile alerter would still output notification alerts for the mobile communication device in both the tethered and un-tethered modes under normal operating conditions, but the built-in notification system of the mobile communication device could be used as a back-up (e.g. if the mobile communication device cannot communicate with the mobile alerter).

All of the features recited in amended claims 1 and 7, and accordingly dependent claims 2-6, are not disclosed in Fujisawa. Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 USC §102 is requested.

With respect to the claim rejections under 35 USC §103, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be some reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claimed limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not in this Applicants' disclosure.

In this case, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. More specifically, none of the references, taken alone or in combination, provide a mobile alerter that forms the notification unit of the mobile communication device, whereby the same mobile alerter outputs notification

Appl. No. 10/825,104
Amdt. Dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 17, 2005

alerts for the mobile communication device both when in the tethered mode and when in the un-tethered mode. Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 USC §103 is requested.


Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 7 define patentable subject matter for the foregoing reasons, and that claims 2-6, which depend on amended claim 1, also define patentable subject matter for the same reasons.

The Applicants also submit replacement drawings to replace the informal drawings of record. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-7 which remain pending in this application, are now in form for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, he is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Bereskin & Parr
Agents for the Applicants

By  _____
Kendrick Lo
Reg. No. 54,948
(416) 364-7311